UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/685,566	10/16/2003	Jayadev Billa	BBNT- P01-087	7175

28120   7590   09/27/2007
ROPES & GRAY LLP
PATENT DOCKETING 39/41
ONE INTERNATIONAL PLACE
BOSTON, MA 02110-2624

EXAMINER
JACKSON, JAKIEDA R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2626	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/27/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _16 July 2007_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-30_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-30_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)./Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   In response to the Office Action mailed March 12, 2007, applicant submitted an

amendment filed on July 16, 2007, in which the applicant traversed and requested

reconsideration.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant argues that the Declarations establish reduction to practice of the

invention claimed in the present application prior to September 2002, the filing of MA.

Applicants submit that the Declarations by Jayadev Billa and Francis Kubala act to

remove the Ma patent as a referenced against the claims of the present application.

The Ma reference has been removed, but the claims remain rejected in view of new

grounds of rejections.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by
> another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent
> granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the
> applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section
> 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States
> only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2)
> of such treaty in the English language.

5.   **Claims 1-7, 10-15, 17-21, 24-28 and 30** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as

being anticipated by Ritchie et al. (USPN 7,257,528), hereinafter referenced as Ritchie.

Regarding **claims 1, 10, 24 and 30**, Ritchie discloses a method, system, device and medium, hereinafter referenced as a method, for specifying a pronunciation of a word comprising:

receiving a written version of the word defined by a series of characters (written; column 1, lines 12-60 with column 2, liens 63-67);

separating the written version of the word into the series of characters (character separator; column 11, lines 61-67); and

generating symbols that define a pronunciation of the word based solely on the series of characters (pronunciation; column 2, lines 63-67 with column 3, lines 11-20 and column 16, lines 48-65).

Regarding **claim 2**, Ritchie discloses a method wherein receiving a written version of the word includes:

receiving the written version of the word from a user (operator; column 6, lines 1-11).

Regarding **claims 3 and 11**, Ritchie discloses a method wherein receiving a written version of the word includes:

receiving the written version of the word from a program that autoRitchietically scans a network (computer network; column 13, lines 17-32).

Regarding **claims 4, 12, 18 and 25**, Ritchie discloses a method wherein the generated symbols have a one-to-one correspondence with the series of characters (correspondence; column 1, line 61 – column 2, line 39 and column 7, lines 16-22).

Regarding **claims 5, 13, 19 and 26**, Ritchie discloses a method wherein the

generated symbols correspond to predetermined character groupings from the series of

characters (group of characters; column 8, lines 22-61 and column 14, lines 45-56 and

column 15, lines 18-35).

Regarding **claims 6, 14, 20 and 27**, Ritchie discloses a method wherein the

predetermined character groupings are determined based on a statistical analysis of a

language (probability; column 18, lines 26-53).

Regarding **claims 7, 15, 21 and 28**, Ritchie discloses a method wherein the

statistical analysis is based on frequency of occurrence of the words in the language

(frequency occurrence of the word; column 7, lines 2-22).

Regarding **claims 8, 16, 22 and 29**, Ritchie discloses a method comprising:

classifying the word into one of a predetermined plurality of classifications (sets;

column 7, lines 16-22); and

generating the symbols based on the classification of the word (group of

characters; column 8, lines 22-61 and column 14, lines 45-56 and column 15, lines 18-

35).

Regarding **claim 17**, Ritchie discloses a method comprising:

configuring a dictionary creation (dictionary; column 9, lines 3-21 and column 11,

lines 14-60 and column 19, lines 22-31) component to generate symbols (symbols;

column 1, lines 12-60) that represent pronunciations of words in a target language

(pronunciation), the symbols being generated based solely on written representations of

the words (written) and the configuring being performed based on the target language

(column 2, lines 63-67 and column 3, lines 12-20 and column 6, lines 1-11);

provides the dictionary creation component with written words (written; column

1, lines 12-21 ad column 2, lines 63-67); and

receiving the symbols that represent pronunciations of the written words from the

dictionary creation component (pronunciation; column 2, lines 63-67 and column 3, lines

12-20).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7.   **Claims 9 and 23** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over

Ritchie in view of Vitale et al. (USPN 6,347,295), hereinafter referenced as Vitale.

Regarding **claims 9 and 23**, Ritchie discloses a method for specifying a

pronunciation of a word, but does not specifically teach a method wherein the

classifications are based on word affixes.

Vitale discloses a method wherein the classifications are based on word affixes

(grouped such as suffix, prefix and infix rules; column 5, lines 42-56), to automatically

generate grapheme-to-phoneme rules.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ritchie's method wherein the classifications are based on word affixes, as taught by Vital, to automatically generate grapheme-to-phoneme rules instead of having a human linguist manually analyze dictionary entries to determine grapheme-to-phoneme patterns and manually type the rules into a rule set (column 2, lines 61-67).

Conclusion

8.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jakieda R. Jackson whose telephone number is 571-272-7619. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 5:30am-2:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Hudspeth can be reached on 571-272-7843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JRJ
September 19, 2007

DAVID HUDSPETH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600